

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,872	02/28/	2007	Cliff Aaby	9501-US1 (287846US28PCT)	8680
88095 ARRIS				EXAMINER	
3871 Lakefield Drive				CHOKSHI, PINKAL R	
Suwanee, GA 30024				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2425	
				NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
				06/29/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail $\,$ address(es):

mirho@fspllc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)				
10/578,872	AABY ET AL.				
Examiner	Art Unit				
PINKAL R. CHOKSHI	2425				
	10/578,872 Examiner	10/578,872 AABY ET AL. Examiner Art Unit			

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 June 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706,07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of

	a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AME	NDMENTS
з. 🗀	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:, (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. 🗆	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. 🗆	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. 🛚	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \(\) will not be entered, or b) \(\) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
	Claim(s) allowed:
	Claim(s) objected to:
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>17-21</u> .
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
<u>AFFI</u>	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and

was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. Other:

/Brian T Pendleton/ /PINKAL R CHOKSHI/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425 Examiner, Art Unit 2425 Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant alleges that the Dunn and/or Strauss does not teach communication of the pause position between set top and headend. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. Combination of Dunn and Strauss is used to reject this limitation, where Strauss discloses (col.26, line 56-col.27, line 3) that the MPEG stream that is delivered to the STB includes timespass, which is used as time-position information marker and Dunn discosses (col.26, line 56-5) that the STB transmits a pause message (marker) that identifies pause point in the VOD program in the memory location that matches to the juncture of the program when paused to the headend.

Furthermore, Applicant asserts that Bedgedijan and/or Huber does not teach a system in which separate streams are used for markers and a count per interval of the markers. Examiner respectfully disagress. Combination of Bedgedijan and Huber teaches this limitation, where Bedgedijan discloses (col.2, lines 45-67; col.4, lines 15-21) that the number of markers are giontly districted into a time interval of the downstream channel that uses CAMI frequency to deliver the markers, and Huber discloses (giont. (gio76, [gio85]) that the number of time-slots that are embedded in the video stream are shown by the markers, where the information on the number of time-slots are provided to different devices using ADM transmission.

Furthermore, Examiner would like to suggest Applicant to further clarify the number (count) of markers used in the last limitation to distinguish from a particular number of markers inserted in the first stream.